DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 356 720 HE 026 376

AUTHOR Knefelkamp, L. Lee; And Others
TITLE "Is This Good for Our Students?" Two Papers from the 1991 CIC Deans Institute.
INSTITUTION Council of Independent Colleges, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jul 92
NOTE 19p.; Keynote address from the Council of Independent College' Deans Institute (November 2, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; College Administration; College Faculty; *Cooperation; *Departments; *Educational Philosophy; Higher Education; *Student Personnel Services; *Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS Academic Affairs Committees; Chief Executive Officers

ABSTRACT

This publication contains both a keynote address that called for a new commitment to holistic student education through reintegration of academic and student affairs and a summary of conference participants' responses to the address. The address, by L. Lee Knefelkamp, calls on academic affairs and student affairs professionals to work together to create "The Seamless Curriculum"; that is, to provide holistic student education in a return to the philosophy of higher education on which American colleges were founded. The talk draws attention to the factors that contribute to the continued separation of faculty and student affairs: specialization, pressure for research and scholarship, disdain for student personnel work on the part of academics, and financial competition. To reintegrate academic affairs and student affairs, the speaker urges joint action on multiculturalism and diversity, experiential and service learning, assessment, campus athletics, and the graduate education of both professions. The second paper, prepared by the Collaborative Writing Group of the Council of Independent Colleges, presents the responses of chief student affairs officers and chief academic affairs officers to the keynote ideas. These focus primarily on barriers to communication between the two areas, characteristics of successful cooperative programs, and experiences that would create the ideal graduate in the vision of private college educators. Contains a table summarizing the responses and 12 notes. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED356720

"Is This Good For Our Students?"

Two Papers from the 1991 CIC Deans Institute

Keynote Address:
The Seamless Curriculum
L. Lee Knefelkamp

Results and Analysis:
CIC survey of academic deans
and student affairs deans

HE026376

A REPORT FROM

CIC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council of Independent Colleges
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES
One Dupont Circle, Suite 320
Washington, D.C. 20036

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This report, one in a series of occasional papers, presents ideas on educational issues that are salient today for independent colleges. Our hope is that the ideas contained here will spark campus discussions and a national dialogue. As always, I welcome your thoughts about the material.

Allen P. Splete,
President

This publication was supported by a grant from FIPSE, The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

"It is extraordinary that you [private college academic vice presidents and vice presidents for student development] are here together tonight. This doesn't happen that often; we usually go our separate ways." Thus L. Lee Knefelkamp, in her keynote address to the 19th annual Council of Independent Colleges Deans Institute, acknowledged the unique nature of the conference. For the first time, chief academic affairs officers had invited chief student affairs officers to join them at their national meeting, held November 2-5, 1991 in San Antonio, Texas, to explore the theme "Is This Good for Our Students?"

In addition to the keynote, conference sessions focused on the joint efforts of student affairs and academic affairs professionals in such areas as assessment programs, service learning projects, and the retention of students. The meeting also broke new ground in that a small group of student affairs professionals and their academic colleagues worked together at the conference to produce a "Summary of Participant Ideas on the Institute Theme." The two groups put into practice what they had been hearing about in theory. The second paper in this publication is the fruit of those labors. Based in part on a brief questionnaire completed by the vice presidents for student affairs and academic affairs after the keynote, it presents their ideas about the barriers that separate them, the characteristics they find in successful cooperative programs, and their vision of what experiences the ideal undergraduate education would provide for students.

In her remarks—the first paper in this report—Knefelkamp calls upon both groups to have the courage to create "The Seamless Curriculum," to work together to provide holistic student education, an education of the whole person. In arguing for this return to the philosophy of higher education upon which American colleges were founded, she draws attention to factors that contributed to the continued separation of faculty and student affairs: specialization, pressure for research and scholarship, disdain for student personnel work on the part of academics, and financial competition. To reintegrate academic affairs and student affairs, she urges joint action on the following issues: multiculturalism and diversity, experiential and service learning, assessment, campus athletics, and the graduate education of both professions.

CIC views the working together of academic and student affairs professionals as a significant issue for private college campuses. Teaching students, rather than research or meeting the needs of the off-campus community, is the primary mission of these colleges. The education which these colleges strive to provide goes beyond the intellectual development of the student. It includes in and out-of-classroom experiences; the total campus community is involved in the education. And it is a holistic education, an education of the whole person—social, civic, psychological, physical, spiritual, and intellectual development.

Private colleges can fulfill a unique role in providing a holistic education as they provide a learning community where the small size of the campus makes it possible for all the members of the campus to work toward the student's development. And with all educators on campus (student affairs and academic affairs professionals) having well educated students as their goal, the multiple dimensions of student growth—intellectual, moral, civic, psychological, physical, etc. —can receive attention from educators with expertise in those areas.

For contributions to the conference and this publication, many thanks are due: to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education for the award of the Lecturers Program grant which supported the keynote address and this publication; to L. Lee Knefelkamp for her presentation; to the Collaborative Writing Group of student affairs and academic deans (see page 11) for spending many hours writing and analyzing survey data at the conference, and to CIC Vice President Russell Garth for coordinating the Group's work. Thanks go as well to three CIC representatives of student affairs organizations who joined the Council of Independent Colleges' Deans Task Force to help plan the meeting—Sr. Elizabeth Cashman, College of Mount St. Joseph, National Association for Women in Education; Tiffany L. McKillip, Greensboro College, American College Personnel Association; and Larry Roper, St. John Fisher College, National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Finally, for their considerable work in helping to plan the conference, we thank the members of CIC's Deans Task Force (affiliations are as of the time of their task force service): W.H. Bearce, Central College; H. David Brandt, Bethel College; Preston Forbes, Heidelberg College; Stephen Good, Drury College; Carol Hinds, Saint Mary College; Gwendolyn Jensen, Marietta College; James Lawrence, College of Santa Fe; Robert Satcher, Saint Paul's College; Jean Sweat, Mount Mercy College; Thomas Trebon, Sacred Heart University; and Ruby Watts, Benedict College.

CIC plans further work to foster collaboration between academic and student affairs professionals to provide a holistic education for undergraduate students.

Mary Ann F. Rehnke
Director of Annual Programs
July 1992

The Seamless Curriculum

L. Lee Knefelkamp
Professor of Higher Education and Director, Doctoral Program in College Teaching and Academic Leadership, Teachers College, Columbia University

Keynote Address Delivered at The Council of Independent Colleges' Deans Institute, November 2, 1991

Between my junior and senior years at Macalester College, I went to Amsterdam as the first international individual ever allowed to study and to teach riding at the Netherland Royal Stable. My family raised horses; I had ridden all my life and had been a member of the junior Olympic team. I was told that I would be teaching some of the children in the royal family. So, I reviewed my French, and with great excitement I arrived at the stables ready to fulfill my responsibilities. On the first day, I found no children, no riding instructions, no lessons. Instead, I was asked to bring a horse into the center of the ring and show that I could work with the animal. I stood in the middle of the glittering room, with chandeliers and windows all around me. The horse, meanwhile, does nothing I ask it to do but stares at me with its big, brown eyes. To my shock and chagrin, I realized that the horse does not speak English and I do not speak Dutch.

That horse and I were in the same place, at the same time, ostensibly for the same purpose. The training we both had received, which resulted in our being in that room, would indicate that we would be able to do what was required of us. But we did not speak each other's language, either literally or metaphorically. In a similar way, student affairs professionals and academic scholars—on the same campus; at the same time; ostensibly for the same purpose of educating students, be they seventeen, twenty-seven, or fifty-seven years old—do not know how to speak each other's language.

Partial Knowledge

Elizabeth Kamarck Minnich, in her extraordinary work *Transforming Knowledge*, stated that American higher education has had, and perhaps always will have, a curriculum that represents partial knowledge. The actions of innumerable people and movements throughout history have been excluded from what has been taught and learned—and from what now is being taught and learned. Partial knowledge, Minnich suggested, means significant and dramatic omissions have been made of information that leads to understanding of other people, of different ways to examine the same information, and of diversity. Yet, by necessity, teachers are doomed to partial teaching, and students to partial learning.

The partial knowledge academic affairs and student affairs have of each other likewise dooms them to create inadequate structures in higher education institutions. The result—from small liberal arts colleges to large state universities—has been another form of partial education for students. According to a recent Association of American Colleges report, seniors, after four years at liberal arts institutions, said that they had difficulty linking the courses in their major to one another, they had significant difficulty linking the courses in their major to courses in the general education curriculum, and they had further significant difficulty linking their entire undergraduate liberal arts education to the community at large.

Why are students, after four years of intensive study, having problems making the kinds of connections that the curriculum, the mission statement, the faculty, the student affairs professionals, and the higher education administrators are employed to facilitate? The goal is not dis-connection. No faculty member stands in front of a class to teach dis-connection. No dean conducts a faculty meeting to foster dis-connection. But, significantly, students are conscious of

this difficulty to connect, and they are aware that the colleges and universities that they attend often do not provide the kind of connectedness that they feel should be provided. While students understand their role and their responsibility for making connections work, they also know when the academic scholars and student affairs professionals have succeeded and when they have failed.

In "Seasons of Academic Life," published in 1990, I spoke of a critical season in the life of an academic community, a season called "courage."

> This is the most important season in our collective academic lives. It is the season in which we must give up the notion of privilege, mastery, and control, and venture into the uncharted territory of creating new educational cultures. We are faced with creating a national educational culture that reflects the complexities of all our historical and intellectual traditions, plus the complexities of a domestic and global society, that demands a continuous expansion of our intellectual structures and traditions. We cannot afford the error of conceptualizing "diversity" as a challenge resolved merely by increasing numbers in the academic population at all levels. Numeric presence is no guarantee of influence, of being taken seriously, of having an effective voice in the shaping of academic cultures.

We must find ways to talk to each other, new ways to listen to each other, not just to cross racial and ethnic and gender diversity, but across the very institutional structural roles that we have created, that too often imprison us.

Separatist Structure

With this call for new educational cultures, or the seamless curriculum, I wish to level my strongest criticism of what I believe is the too-long unquestioned and separatist structure in American higher education. This structure results in an apartheid system that reinforces false dichotomies between and among faculty members and student affairs personnel, our personal and professional lives, our mind, our body, and our spirits, our ability to think and to feel and to act, and our ability to be both passionate and purposeful about what it is that we wish to achieve.

"Apartheid" is not a word to be used lightly. As a Jewish woman in the world, I bridle when someone uses the word "holocaust" in an ill-conceived or metaphoric way. Words have meaning. "Holocaust" has a meaning. "The Middle Passage" has a meaning. "The Killing Fields" has a meaning. "Apartheid" has a meaning—a meaning that is associated with the history of a certain place in a certain time. "Apartheid" is an obscenity of South Africa, where the official policy of racial segregation makes most citizens prisoners in their own country, denied majority rule. Metaphorically, various "apartheid" systems exist in the United States; that is, separate cultures exist in separate territories, each with little knowledge, understanding, or respect for the other. Academic affairs and student affairs in American higher education are two such cultures. This separateness and disdain—evident, for example, in off-the-cuff remarks and in private conversations—has been more detrimental to students than anything else in American higher education.

How did academic affairs and student affairs, living side by side for years on the same campus, evolve into separate cultures, with so little knowledge of one another? Why do faculty members not know the background and academic training of student affairs personnel, and vice versa? Why is the daily life of a professor or a counselor or an admissions officer generally not known? Why are student affairs professionals routinely omitted from any discussion of the curriculum? Why are Ph.D.s in education degraded and liberal arts Ph.D.s exalt-

ed? How could a group of educators, committed to the holistic development of students, create a system in American higher education that organizationally and psychologically resulted in separatism not only for faculty and student affairs personnel but also for students? Separatism has hurt the educational system and the students as well as faculty and student affairs professionals as members of a group and as individuals.

Logic does not dictate that educators would naturally fall into structural and hierarchical pejoratives about one another. But they have. How did this system of separatism develop? How could a system evolve that accepts liberal arts faculty members recommending students graduating from a doctoral program in education for teaching and academic leadership positions at community colleges but not at liberal arts colleges because they had spent more time studying students than advancing certain skills and pursuing specific knowledge in another discipline? How did that happen?

Historical Perspectives

Early American higher education, according to the scholarly literature, was about holism—the whole person, the whole student. American higher education was founded on the British system. The notion of holistic development, which was reflected in residential campuses, was in vogue until the mid-nineteenth century. A clear understanding existed from campus to campus of the holistic nature of student education. Those involved in education were not confined to particular roles as faculty or student affairs. Instead, a mixture of roles was assumed, multiple roles were taken on, while enormous attention was paid to holistic development. In 1701, during the founding of Yale, a controversy arose about whether the college would abandon the residential system—and, in effect, the holistic system—in favor of "European intellectualism," which derived from continental Europe. So began what became known as the holism versus intellectualism debate.

Until about 1840, the holistic philosophers reigned. Higher education remained largely residential. Where it was not, the shaping of the curriculum and the ways in which students were advised and counseled about the larger issues in their developmental lives—intellect being clearly one of them, but only one of them—were done consciously and deliberately. Then, a strong influence began being felt from German scholars and a new type of professor emerged in American higher education. William H. Cowley, who served as president of Hamilton College and as a distinguished professor at Ohio State University and Stanford University, wrote an article in the 1930s called "Intelligence Is Not Enough: Holism and the Liberal Arts College, The Development of the Whole Man." According to an 1849 journal cited by Cowley, promotions in salary and rank for these new professors would be related to the scholarly books and articles they published and not to their teaching and their service to the larger community. The continental European belief, adopted in the United States, was that the sole—not merely the primary—purpose of having a student seek higher education was cultivation of the intellect. Where the student lived, how the student lived, or how the student's values system was influenced by his education were none of the university's business. Tension was great 150 years ago, when colleges and universities were faced with the decision of continuing to facilitate holistic development or pursuing exclusively the intellectual development of their students. Although the dichotomy was false, that was how the debate was couched.

Esther Lloyd-Jones in the 1920s called for a move away from this dualistic conception of teachers versus student personnel workers toward a relational perspective. She encouraged personnel workers and teachers

to work together as educators to accomplish common objectives, both inside and outside the classroom. She advocated leaving behind hierarchical leadership and hierarchical roles and assuming connected roles in "student ecology," an educational ecology for the good of students. She wanted to see less specialization and more consultation. And she was interested in losing the separatist perspective that only one degree or one experience grants a person expertise as well as in reintroducing participation and sharing.

Also in the 1920s, L. B. Hopkins, president of Wabash College, made the point that the word "personnel" had different meanings to different people and that faculty had no real understanding of what student affairs professionals were attempting to accomplish in student personnel work. During this same period of time, William Cowley criticized both the faculty and student affairs for being "murky." He also wrote of his "growing conviction that not all professors are temperamentally equipped to deal with students outside the classroom."

In the 1930s, when Cowley wrote "Intelligence is Not Enough," the arguments still were being presented as two conflicting views: the whole person versus the intellect alone. And, at that time, student affairs functions and academic affairs functions were increasingly diverging; those who routinely met as part of the president's staff or the dean's staff now were meeting separately. People who were part of an educational team found themselves splintered into specializations and no longer functioning as a diverse collection of interests.

The debate evolved: Were education and student personnel work synonymous? Was it ethical to consider individual development for the sake of individual development? Were thoughts of individualization possible, given the large influx of students into colleges and universities? Faculty members wanted to restrict the student affairs function to placing students in jobs. The faculty later expanded its ideas and decided student affairs personnel could do research—if it were about students and if it were limited to advising the institution in general about structure and organization and stayed away from telling the faculty how to teach. Faculty members were convinced that student personnel functions essentially should be psychological in nature; student affairs would prepare the body and mind for class, and the faculty would take it from there.

As the debate moved into the 1930s, the faculty were seen to have dual functions; they could teach as well as perform student personnel roles such as guidance counseling, advising, and mentoring. The student affairs professionals, however, were told they could not do both, regardless of the degrees they had earned, regardless of the knowledge they had of developmental theory or anthropology or psychology or any other of the related fields. If one analyzes the 1939 statement, *The Student Personnel Point of View*, there are twenty-three things that student affairs people are supposed to do. Only *one* of the twenty-three things that define the profession has anything to do with faculty members; it suggests that what student affairs personnel are supposed to do is assemble and make available information to be used in the improvement of instruction and in making the curriculum more flexible.

In her monumental book, *Student Personnel Work as Deeper Teaching*, published in 1954, Esther Lloyd-Jones made a plea to faculty members and student affairs people to take the worth of the individual into account and to treat each other with "equal dignity." She said the world must have a place for everybody. She lamented the kind of increased specialization that was producing faculty who were more attentive to research and writing than to students and was producing student affairs professionals

who were seen as completely separate in their own domain.

In the 1960s, E.G. Williamson wrote that the state of student affairs and academic affairs as it existed then must not continue. He described the relationship as lacking collaboration, communication, and respect and noted that student affairs was counted out whenever intellectual aspects of student life were at issue.

Finally, Clyde Parker wrote in 1970 in an agonized paper entitled "Ashes, Ashes," the last one he wrote before leaving the profession, "that student personnel work had contributed much to the understanding of how students develop and who students are, but it had failed to tie itself to the central mission of the college. The inability to become linked to the central academic function of institutes of higher education, he said, was student affairs' greatest difficulty. He also discussed student activism in the 1960s and how students saw student affairs people as largely irrelevant to their experience as activists. Parker revealed his acceptance of the current system when he went on to say that, although faculty members and administrators also were irrelevant to student expression at that time, he could excuse them because faculty had a right to be preoccupied with their disciplines and administrators with administering the university. He writes, "we have failed, all of us, in our promise largely because we have been too limited in our vision, by confining our practices almost exclusively to either in- or out-of-class activities within the institution. There must be a permeable membrane between in-class and out-of-class activities that allow the free access of faculty, students, and student personnel workers to each other's spheres."

No faculty member now believes that he or she is dealing only with a student's mind; no student affairs professional believes that he or she is dealing only with a student's body. Furthermore, at least three-quarters of all students believe that the most important educational experiences that they will ever have will take place outside the classroom.

Barriers to Cooperation

What I have called the seamless curriculum and what Esther Lloyd-Jones called deeper teaching is fundamentally our goal: the notion that in-class and out-of-class experience together produce growth. But that is not to say that one plus the other equals holistic education. The review of the scholarly literature reflects the tradition of faculty and student affairs being unable to speak each other's language and excusing their inattention to students because other things needed attending. The tradition lives on. More recently, four factors contributed to the continued separation between faculty and student affairs and the continued inability each has of understanding the other.

Specialization. Since the beginning of the 1980s, according to Lynne V. Cheney in *Tyrannical Machines*, the number of professional journals has quadrupled. Young faculty members have been under tremendous pressure to publish—and furthermore to publish significantly. The world has become increasingly specialized, and as a result, the faculty, to survive and succeed in the academic culture, also has had to specialize. Academic scholars are not the only ones, however; so, too, have student affairs professionals. Student personnel administration supports numerous organizations, each with its own concerns. Specialization has led to an increased separateness between faculty and student affairs and an increased separateness from students.

Research and Scholarship Pressure. As more intensive scholarship has been demanded of them, faculty have moved further away from contact with undergraduate students. The most powerful negotiating tool in faculty hiring is the offer of a reduced teaching load. Some faculty mem-

bers singled out for their accomplishments inside the classroom are rewarded with fewer teaching responsibilities. The time and energy needed to do serious research results in a compression of the time faculty can give to students.

Disdain for Student Personnel Work. Metaphorically speaking, faculty do "real work," and student personnel administrators do "housework." Faculty are concerned with the central mission of the university; student affairs people do the other. The relative values placed on these two functions are easy enough to determine: Compare how much faculty are paid with how much student affairs staff are paid. Society pays for what it values; it pays more for what it values more. For example, at the liberal arts college where I formerly worked, the dean of student affairs, who was on staff four times longer than any other member of the president's council, was the lowest paid of all the vice presidents and officers. The reason was not that her talent was wanting but because that was how student affairs was budgeted.

Financial Competition. The University of Maryland recently took a series of hits—faculty were furloughed and subject to pay cuts, and 247 people were laid off, 85 percent of whom were professional staff in student services or academic support services. Academic affairs and student affairs are in financial competition, fighting for pieces of a shrinking pie. A department chair says not to touch the faculty, cut someone else; a student affairs vice president argues that personnel services are important and necessary.

Ironically, the most significant report in American higher education to emerge since the early 1980s, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, advocated that faculty and student affairs take on a more holistic perspective. It asks higher education to reward faculty not just for the scholarship of creation but for the scholarship of integration, for the scholarship of application in experiential learning and in community service, and for the scholarship of teaching itself. The report said that American higher education is at risk and that faculty are leading bifurcated lives. But they were bifurcated long ago.

Required Action

Knowing history and understanding the problem, what is required? The answer: moral action, courageous action. Mission statements must be reexamined; obligations to students reassessed. Values need to be prioritized. To reintegrate meaningfully academic affairs and student affairs, action must be taken in several critical areas where little now is happening.

Multiculturalism and Diversity. Three issues fall within the purview of this category, beginning with the introduction of concerns about gender, race, class, ethnicity, and culture into the curriculum. A determination needs to be made about what a general education curriculum is—whether at a small liberal arts college, a large state university, or a community college. What should students learn and how will the current curriculum be changed?

Secondly, hate crimes have proliferated on college and university campuses. The First Amendment is being used to give license to everybody to say almost anything at any time. A climate of increased tolerance for violence—verbal and physical—is present.

Third, work on multiculturalism and diversity is bifurcated. Faculty committees are doing serious and significant work to bring multiculturalism into the curriculum, while student affairs individuals are doing serious and significant work to train their peers to be sensitive to diversity. However, no dialogue is exchanged between them. Workshops on sexual harassment are held, while sexual harassment persists inside the

classroom. In the same way, a student will attend a workshop on, for example, racial discrimination, then go to class and feel insulted, ignored, or annoyed. The experience is bifurcated. A multicultural curriculum opens up all kinds of knowledge to the student inside the classroom, but outside the classroom the student faces abrogation of rights, unchecked hate speech, and general lack of guidance.

Faculty and student affairs professionals cannot do a good job on multicultural and diversity issues without doing it together. We have need for each other.

Experiential and Service Learning. In an informal survey which I conducted of three hundred general education curriculum documents chosen at random from around the country, only ten provided evidence that student affairs individuals—from offices of experiential learning or service learning—had been consulted or involved with the committees that created the final curriculum. Even though we have spent untold faculty time on the general education curriculum, few faculty have thought to bring into the process the people who can bridge the gap between theory and practice.

Student affairs professionals must be recognized as having expertise which can advance formation of the general education curriculum. When I was an academic dean, I found that the person who knew the most about independent studies and how students performed was not a member of the faculty, under whose auspices the program was sponsored, but the assistant director of experiential learning, who read the learning contracts, followed up with the students to see what they had learned, and tried to determine whether any effort had been made to integrate the student's experience with the student's coursework.

Assessment. Assessment probably is the largest funded movement in American higher education. Faculty members are being asked to evaluate student learning in new and complicated ways and in a variety of areas, including critical thinking skills; basic learning skills in reading, writing, and math; the college environment and its impact on values; and the notion of learning styles and how they relate to classroom teaching. Faculty also are being asked to help students with student learning portfolios and to provide teaching portfolios on themselves.

Most student affairs individuals are trained in theories of human development and in processes of assessment of critical thinking, learning styles, and student learning. Faculty possess a broad, rich, and extraordinarily wide range of understanding about how students learn, what they say, and how transitions in thinking are made as students move from one experience to another. Adequate assessments of students or faculty or colleges cannot be made without the formation of assessment teams that cut across academic affairs and student affairs. Examinations of, for example, campus ecology, student learning, staff development, and faculty development need to be done from a shared pool of expertise.

Campus Athletics. Campus athletics is rife with racism and sexism. Faculty at liberal arts colleges as well as state universities have almost entirely ignored the ethical responsibilities of campus athletics until and unless a scandal emerges, such as at North Carolina State University and the University of Maryland, that costs the faculty and the schools their reputation and diverts substantial amounts of money to pay for lawsuits. Attention has been paid to the academic preparation of athletes. But while the tutorial system helps athletics, no redress is made for the underlying structural evils of racism and sexism that are perpetuated in college athletics. Since the National Collegiate Athletic Association took over women's and men's athletics, a dramatic reduction in the number of women coaches has taken place. Surveys show an enormous amount of

homophobia in the hiring of women. A woman considered assertive is branded too feminist and thus also may be suspected of being a lesbian. No job offer comes as a result. Only 2 percent of all athletic directors in the country are women—and only one of them is not at a predominantly women's college. Faculty have ignored these issues until their ox has been gored, and they have realized that the millions of dollars that have been spent in lawsuits have cost them precious faculty lines in the budget.

Student affairs also has remained detached. In newspaper accounts of ten major athletic scandals—in student newspapers and general public papers such as the *Washington Post* and the *Philadelphia Inquirer*—not one student affairs professional spoke out about or criticized what happened, either before or after. This issue is important not just to the particular athletes involved or the particular school; it is important to every student who watches how faculty and student affairs personnel respond to these scandals. Students wonder why no one will talk about these real and exploitative issues—issues that affect them. Student affairs and academic affairs professionals have to get together on this; it is a common ethical issue.

Graduate Education. Graduate education must change. Student affairs professionals must become more intellectual; their curriculum is woefully narrow, lacking an understanding of the major arena for faculty work, the undergraduate college curriculum. There needs to be an understanding of general education, reading beyond Jossey-Bass publications, and an ability to talk with faculty about the explosion of knowledge in their disciplines. Student affairs professionals and academic affairs professionals have courses that divide, courses that separate, and courses that do not help us join the larger culture, even though these courses teach many things.

The traditional Ph.D. of the academic professional, too, must change. As graduate students prepare to become faculty, they have courses in their discipline but nobody ever suggests that there will be a live body out there when they start to teach students. Nobody ever suggests that the diversity of the student body may almost overwhelm them when they walk into class. And nobody dares to suggest that practical application—learning about college teaching—might be a helpful addition to the doctor of *philosophy* degree. But short of waiting for graduate education to change, because none of us will be alive when it does, what can we do now?

Courage is required now—the same courage that faculty and student affairs require of students as they move toward their own holistic development, with or without help; as they venture into new intellectual arenas, to be confused, terrified, and exhilarated; as they are asked to accept that knowledge is relative to context, but faith and religious commitment are not; and as they are encouraged to become active citizens for the good of themselves and others.

Academic affairs and student affairs have a reciprocal obligation to students—to serve them well, to serve them better. Have the courage to cross the campus mall. Have the courage to convene a meeting with academic affairs and student affairs educators in attendance, where all are working on common, intellectual, psychological, and sociological problems that exist in the education of students. Examine the make-up of the curriculum committee. Look at who hires the resident life staff. Consider comparable worth. Look at whether or not there is room for us to make permeable membranes. Talk to each other, respect each other, listen to each other—then bring those behaviors and attitudes into daily exchanges, into committee meetings, into financial practices, so that the education of the whole student becomes increasing facilitated

because that student is being served by the whole educational faculty, student affairs and faculty members alike. If student affairs professionals and faculty require courage in their undergraduates, student affairs professionals and faculty can require no less from themselves.

Sources Cited

Page 2 Elizabeth Kamarck Minnich, *Transforming Knowledge* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990).

Robert Zemsky, *Structure and Coherence: Measuring the Undergraduate Curriculum* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1989).

Page 3 L. Lee Knefelkamp, "Seasons of Academic Life: Honoring Our Collective Autobiography," *Liberal Education* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, Vol. 76, No. 3, May/June 1990), page 10.

Page 4 William H. Cowley, "Intelligence Is Not Enough: Holism and the Liberal Arts College, The Development of the Whole Man." The article is in Cowley's Collected Papers (unpublished) in the private collection of L. Lee Knefelkamp at Teachers College/Columbia University, New York City.

Esther Lloyd-Jones, *Student Personnel Work at Northwestern University* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1929).

Page 5 L. B. Hopkins, "Personnel Procedures in Education," *The Education Record Supplement* (Vol. 7, No. 3, October 1926).

The Student Personnel Point of View. American Council on Educational Studies (Series I, Vol. 1, No. 3, June, 1937).

Esther Lloyd-Jones and Margaret Ruth Smith, editors. *Student Personnel Work As Deeper Teaching* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954).

Page 6 E. G. Williamson, *Student Personnel Work in Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1961), page 34.

The original "Ashes, Ashes" was presented to the 20th Annual Institute for College Student Personnel Workers Conference, University of Minnesota, October 1969. It was later published as "Institutional Self-Renewal in Higher Education," *Journal of College Student Personnel* (November 1971), pages 405-409.

Lynne V. Cheney, *Tyrannical Machines* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1990.

Page 7 Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

"Is This Good for Our Students?"

What are the barriers to communication between academic and student affairs professionals?

What are the characteristics of successful cooperative programs?

What experiences would a student have that would create the ideal graduate in the vision of private college educators?

Chief student affairs officers and chief academic affairs officers addressed these questions in writing at the Council of Independent Colleges' 1991 Deans Institute. Their answers were responses to the conference's keynote address by L. Lee Knefelkamp and included the results of their conversations, conducted prior to the conference, with their campus counterpart (academic or student dean). A team of student affairs and academic affairs professionals worked together at the Institute to summarize their colleagues' ideas. This paper is the result of the team's collaborative writing project.

Mary Ann F. Rehnke

Summary of Participant Ideas On the Institute Theme: "Is It Good for Our Students?"

Prepared by the Collaborative Writing Group:

Russell Garth, Council of Independent Colleges
Ronald Kovach, Illinois Benedictine College
Margaret Maki, Bradford College
Larry Roper, St. John Fisher College
Janet Sheeran, Rockhurst College
John Tresch, Bluefield College
Vance Yoder, Iowa Wesleyan College

CIC Deans Institute
November 2-5, 1991

Following the address by L. Lee Knefelkamp on fostering collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs, sixty nine student affairs professionals and one hundred and four academic administrators responded in writing to six questions related to the theme of the 1991 Deans Institute. This paper summarizes the results of that survey.

Barriers to Communication

Regarding the barriers to communication between academic and student affairs, replies can be organized into two categories: systemic and attitudinal. A preponderance of both student and academic affairs leaders observed that the organizational structure is not conducive to communication and cooperation. Physical separation of those offices; competition for resources; organizational patterns such as reporting structures, committee membership, information flow and task-orientation; and job descriptions divide rather than join these groups. At least 20% of both groups observed that the traditional interpretation of these roles significantly interferes with better collaboration.

Another barrier to communication and collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs arises from the perception each group has of the other, often arising from a lack of knowledge about their counterparts. To student affairs people, faculty show a lack of interest. Faculty understand that the institution does not reward their involvement in student affairs. Both groups perceive a certain elitism by faculty members who do not view co-curricular and student affairs to be as important as academics.

Both sides are characterized as possessing a lack of knowledge of the roles of the other, viewing themselves as separate with different backgrounds and different goals. They do not think and dream together.

The third factor identified by a majority of student affairs professionals and nearly 40% of academics is lack of time. Their heavy workloads and preponderance of other issues preclude collaboration with the other group on anything but a "crisis orientation" basis.

Characteristics of Successful Collaborative Projects

Characteristics found in the successful cooperative student affairs/academic affairs programs may be summarized in seven categories. Receiving by far the greatest emphasis by both groups is the need for mutuality and cooperation. Successful programs are generated from shared vision, joint planning, and mutual respect. Over 50% of both groups identified that programs designed for special populations are likely to provide opportunities for collaboration—cited were freshman and senior courses or experiences, honors programs, support programs for at-risk students, and programs for international students. Twice as many student affairs professionals (28%) as academics (14%) mentioned programs dealing with life planning or values-oriented goals: service projects, campus ministries and spirituality, wellness, etc. Many more academics cited campus-wide services as enabling collaboration: academic advising, convocations, fine arts programs, co-curricular activities, multicultural activities, institutional retention and funding efforts. Involving faculty and students received some emphasis. Finally, assessment of the programs is recognized by some as a characteristic of success.

The Vision: Experiences that Students Should Have

When the two groups responded to the request to describe the experiences students would have on their campuses in order to become the ideal graduate, a series of topics emerged which can be gathered into two groupings. First are those experiences which can be identified by some existing and recognizable component of the undergraduate experience: classes in the core curriculum and major field; new student and capstone integrative experiences; co-curricular programs; residence life; service learning and/or internships, etc. Certain kinds of content are cited or implied. Developing critical thinking abilities (including problem solving and decision making), gaining skills in gathering knowledge, including library usage; good communication skills; earning good grades and other honors; and planning to pursue graduate study. Approximately two-thirds of the responses from both groups are represented in these identifiable classroom and out-of-class experiences.

Over one-third of the responses, however, cannot be relegated to specific classes/programs/experiences. These include interaction with faculty and staff members; collaboration among themselves as students; development of social awareness; development of a strong sense of self-confidence, wholeness, maturity, discipline, intellectuality, creativity, flexibility, wellness, responsibility; possessing tolerance of other cultures; and evidencing leadership qualities.

These characteristics do not seem to be the property of any single or group of particular experiences; they are the product of the total educational experience. It was pointed out by one member of the collaborative writing group that this last group of responses contain the qualities frequently mentioned in college mission statements.

In analyzing the responses of the academic administrators and student affairs professionals who participated in this exercise, the collaborative writing group found that almost 80% of both groups met to discuss campus issues with their academic/student affairs counterparts at least as frequently as once a week. The other 20% met less often. Nearly 80% also replied that the chief student affairs officer reported directly to the president of their institutions.

Most others reported to the chief academic officer or the executive vice president. A chart recording the actual responses of the two groups appears as an appendix to this paper.

Initial Conclusions

Examining the results of this brief survey leads to a few general conclusions:

(1) Some of the barriers to collaboration are the result of how an institution is typically organized.

(2) Other barriers derive from the ignorance and unproductive attitudes we evidence toward one another.

(3) Mutual planning and respect can produce programs which involve increased collaboration among student affairs and academic affairs.

(4) The vision most of us hold of the ideal graduate necessitates collaboration among all aspects of the college.

(5) A substantial portion of that vision is achieved not by particular programs but by the holistic educational experience—and is not necessarily being addressed by intentional campus efforts right now.

(6) To have the greatest effect, collaboration must be pursued intentionally.

Summary Data

Answers to the first three questions are given in actual numbers, the responses to questions 4-6 are given in percentages. These percentages are based on the number of individuals responding, rather than the number of responses. Thus, some individuals may have given several responses falling into the same category. Participants also offered more than one response to each question.

	Student Affairs Officer	Academic Affairs Officer
Question #1.		
Your function: (total # of respondents)	69	104
Question #2.		
How often do you discuss campus issues with your counterpart in academic and student affairs?		
daily	13	23
weekly	42	59
every week	6	15
monthly	1	7
Question #3.		
To whom does the student affairs officer report?		
president	55	83
chief academic affairs officer	6	1
executive/administrative vice president	2	6
academic & stud. affairs officer same person	1	1
other	1	3
Question #4.		
What have been the major barriers to communication between academic and student affairs on your campus?	%	%
Location - geographic, physical separation, distance	14	11
Budget/resources - competition for resources, availability of funds, too few staff	9	11
Institutional structure and communication patterns	32	44
Lack of structured interaction - committee or division structure/memberships, schedule of meetings, reporting structure, information flow, task-oriented rather than discussion-oriented.		
History/tradition of roles and responsibilities - "Old boys" network, campus culture, separation of powers in job descriptions, segmentation, no common tradition, failure to initiate contact, president's expectations, high turnover in student affairs, privacy of information		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY DATA *(Continued)*	Student Affairs Officer	Academic Affairs Officer
Faculty & academic experience tension between student affairs & faculty rather than between deans, faculty lack of interest, faculty reward system draws attention from whole life of student, faculty abdicate responsibilities then criticize outcomes, little reward for faculty, faculty have limited priorities, faculty don't see student affairs as valid, faculty elitism, narrowness of faculty background, faculty more valued, faculty as primary focus, academic snobbery, faculty focus on classroom, co-curriculum not as important as academics.	17	11
Time - crisis orientation, too many other activities, heavy workload, not enough time, distracted by other issues	51	38
Preoccupation with own areas - desire for independence, territorialism (of either student or academic side), lack of interest by academic affairs & student affairs	1	12
Lack of knowledge of roles - Misunderstanding of student affairs roles, lack of understanding of each other's responsibilities, view selves as separate, mutual ignorance, lack of realization of connectedness, different backgrounds	12	14
Goals - split ownership of educational goals, different goals, lack of common vision or mission, different views of what college education should be, different expectations, don't think & dream together, different approaches, disagreement over what is best for students, perception	7	17
Negative Perceptions - distrust of each other, lack of intelligence by student affairs staff, inexperience of student affairs staff, disrespect, student affairs is necessary evil, lack of confidence in student affairs, poor treatment, student affairs there to keep students out of trouble, stereotypes (student affairs not academic, faculty not practical), blaming for failures, lack of rigor by student affairs, student affairs seen as baby sitters, student affairs seen as nonacademic and nonprofessional	13	14
Importance & status - status hierarchy, second-class citizenship, status differentials—student affairs is soft, lack of vice president title	7	0
Question #5		
What characteristics are found in the successful cooperative student affairs/academic affairs programs on your campus? (i.e., Freshman Year programs, service-learning programs, & orientations).	**%**	**%**
Mutuality & cooperation; mutual respect, shared vision; joint planning	83	108

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY DATA (Continued)	Student Affairs Officer	Academic Affairs Officer
Special populations - at-risk students, freshmen, seniors, honors, international	51	63
Life planning/values - those activities having to do with quality of life issues such as campus ministry, wellness, service learning, spirituality	28	14
All-college resources - services available to all, but frequently requiring student initiative—academic advising, fine arts, convocations, retention efforts, developmental programs, co-curricular activities, multiculturalism, funding	25	40
Faculty involvement	9	9
Student involvement	3	11
Assessment	1	4
Question #6		
What experiences would students have on your campus that would fulfill your vision of your ideal graduate?	%	%
Interaction - with faculty & staff, research with faculty, serve on faculty committees	9	19
Social experiences & collaboration - cooperation among students, interaction with others, sense of community, social awareness, citizenship	14	16
Sense of self - confidence, esteem, wholeness, maturity, image, discipline, marketing yourself, stretch student, intellectual challenge, creativity, flexibility, physical growth, fitness, wellness, personal development, responsibility	28	15
Leadership ability	32	23
Diversity - tolerance, multi-cultural, interaction & learning, international travel, international awareness	28	21
Spiritual - religious development & programming, integrate faith & learning, moral & ethical values, Christian ministry	35	21
Academic program		
Integrate disciplines, integrate core & major, integrate academic & developmental perspective, interdisciplinary;		
Liberal arts - student would encounter disciplines, majors, core curriculum, Great Books;		
Freshman seminar & capstone course;		
Exciting classroom experiences;		
Possess tools of knowledge - critical thinking, problem solving, decision making;		
Lifelong learning - be invested with love of learning; communication skills; prepare for graduate programs; career development strategy; use library; honors; high GPA, assessment	67	47
Co-curricular programs - cultural enrichment beyond class, resident life	10	15
Service learning - internship, cooperative education, experiential, contribute to/prepare for life	62	38
Integrate learning, classroom & co-curricular programs, engagement/personal & academic growth in class & out, blend of academic & experiential	6	16

BEST COPY AVAILABLE